

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

MICHAEL D. CASTRO,

Plaintiff,

v.

TRI MARINE FISH COMPANY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C17-8RSL

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO STRIKE
APPEARANCE AND PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION IN ITS ENTIRETY

This matter comes before the Court on defendants' motion to strike the notice of appearance of plaintiff's counsel William Banning and to strike plaintiff's motion to remand in its entirety. Dkt. # 18. At the time he filed plaintiff's motion to remand, Dkt. # 11, Mr. Banning, an attorney licensed in California, was not admitted to appear *pro hac vice* before this Court. Plaintiff's motion to remand was signed only by Mr. Banning, not by plaintiff's local counsel. Mr. Banning has since been granted leave to appear *pro hac vice*. Dkt. # 16.

The Court reminds counsel that leave to appear *pro hac vice* must be sought and granted for each separate case in which an attorney not licensed in Washington hopes to appear. See Local Civil Rule 83.1(d). In this instance, however, Mr. Banning's omission appears to result from administrative oversight rather than from any deliberate evasion. See Dkt. ## 24, 24-1. Given that Mr. Banning now appears *pro hac vice* and that plaintiff has been represented at all times by local counsel, striking Mr. Banning's appearance and plaintiff's motion at this stage

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION
TO STRIKE APPEARANCE AND PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION IN ITS ENTIRETY - 1

1 would be a futile elevation of form over substance.

2
3 For all the foregoing reasons, defendants' motion to strike (Dkt. # 18) is DENIED.

4
5 DATED this 16th day of March, 2017.

6
7 

8 Robert S. Lasnik
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION
28 TO STRIKE APPEARANCE AND PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION IN ITS ENTIRETY - 2